August 7, 2019

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	TN DE DETEND (1975)
5	IN RE FLINT WATER CASES Case No. 16-10444
6	
7	/
8	STATUS CONFERENCE
9	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDITH E. LEVY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	AUGUST 7, 2019
12	
13	APPEARANCES IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER
14	Charles E. Barbieri Foster, Swift, Collins & Smith, P.C.
15	313 South Washington Square Lansing, MI 48933
16	Esther Berezofsky
17	Berezofsky Law Group, LLC 210 Lake Drive East, Suite 101
18	Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
19	Frederick A. Berg Butzel Long
20	150 West Jefferson, Suite 100 Detroit, MI 48226
21	Teresa Ann Caine Bingman
22	Law Offices of Teresa A. Bingman 1425 Ambassador Drive
23	Okemos, MI 48864
24	Peretz Bronstein Bronstein, Gewirtz & Grossman LLC
25	60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4600 New York, NY 10165
	•

1	Michael S. Cafferty Michael S. Cafferty & Associates
2	333 West Fort Street, Suite 1400 Detroit, MI 48226
3	James M. Campbell
4 5	Campbell, Campbell, Edwards & Conroy One Constitution Plaza, Suite 300 Boston, MA 02129-2025
6 7	Gladys L. Christopherson Washington Legal 718 Beach Street, P.O. Box 187
8	Flint, MI 48501
9	Alaina Devine Campbell Conroy & O'Neil PC 1 Constitution Wharf, Suite 310
10	Boston, MA 02129
11	Philip A. Erickson Plunkett & Cooney
12	325 East Grand River Avenue, Suite 250 East Lansing, MI 48823
13	
14	James A. Fajen Fajen & Miller, PLLC
15	3646 West Liberty Road Ann Arbor, MI 48103
16	Shayla A. Fletcher The Fletcher Law Firm, PLLC
17	1637 South Huron Ypsilanti, MI 48197
18	
19	Joseph F. Galvin Genesee County Drain Commissioners 4610 Beecher Road
20	Flint, MI 48532
21	William H. Goodman Goodman and Hurwitz, P.C.
22	1394 East Jefferson Avenue Detroit, MI 48207
23	, in the second of the second
24	Philip A. Grashoff, Jr. Smith Haughey Rice & Roegge 213 South Ashley, Suite 400
25	Ann Arbor, MI 48104

1	Deborah E. Greenspan Special Master
2	
3	David Hart Maddin, Hauser, Roth & Heller, PC 28400 Northwestern Highway Southfield, MI 48034-1839
5	Larry R. Jensen Hall Render Killian Heath & Lyman, PLLC 201 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 1200 Troy, MI 48084
7	- '
8	William Young Kim City of Flint 1101 South Saginaw Street, Third Floor
9	Flint, MI 48502
10	Sheldon H. Klein
11	Butzel Long, P.C. Stoneridge West, 41000 Woodward Avenue
12	Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
13	Kurt E. Krause Chartier Nyamfukudza P.L.C.
14	1905 Abbot Road, Suite 1 East Lansing, MI 48823
15	Richard S. Kuhl
16	Michigan Department of Attorney General ENRA Division, P.O. Box 30755 Lansing, MI 48909
17	
18	Patrick J. Lanciotti Napoli Shkolnik Law PLLC 360 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor
19	New York, NY 10017
20	Theodore J. Leopold
21	Cohen Milstein Sellers and Toll PLLC 2925 PGA Boulevard, Suite 200
22	Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410
23	Emmy L. Levens Cohen Milstein Sellers and Toll PLLC
24	1100 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 500, West Tower Washington, DC 20005
25	wasniingcon, be 20005

1	Cynthia M. Lindsey
2	Cynthia Lindsey & Associates 8900 East Jefferson Avenue, Number 612 Detroit, MI 48214
3	Austen Lott
4 5	Marc J. Bern & Partners 225 West Washington Street, Suite 2200 Chicago, IL 60606
6	Christopher J. Marker
7	O'Neill, Wallace & Doyle P.C. 300 Saint Andrews Road, Suite 302 Saginaw, MI 48638
8	
9	Cirilo Martinez Law Office of Cirilo Martinez, PLLC 3010 Lovers Lane
10	Kalamazoo, MI 49001
11	T. Santino Mateo Perkins Law Group, PLLC
12	615 Griswold, Suite 400 Detroit, MI 48226
13	
14	David W. Meyers Law Office of Edward A. Zeineh 2800 Grand River Avenue, Suite B
15	Lansing, MI 48912
16	Thaddeus E. Morgan Fraser, Trebilcock
17	124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000 Lansing, MI 48933
18	Megan R. Mulder
19	Cline, Cline & Griffin, P.C. 1000 Mott Foundation Building
20	503 South Saginaw Street Flint, MI 48502
21	Paul J. Napoli
22	Napoli Shkolnik PLLC 360 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor
23	New York, NY 10017
24	Solomon M. Radner EXCOLO LAW, PLLC
25	26700 Law, PLLC 26700 Lahser Road, Suite 401 Southfield, MI 48033

1	Alexander S. Rusek White Law PLLC
2	2400 Science Parkway, Suite 201 Okemos, MI 48864
3	
4 5	Gregory Stamatopoulos Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C. 719 Griswold, Suite 620 Detroit, MI 48226
6 7	Corey M. Stern Levy Konigsberg, LLP 800 Third Avenue, Suite 11th Floor
8	New York, NY 10022
9	Craig S. Thompson Sullivan, Ward 25800 Northwestern Highway, Suite 1000
10	Southfield, MI 48075
11	Valdemar L. Washington 718 Beach Street, P.O. Box 187
12	Flint, MI 48501
13	Todd Weglarz Fieger, Fieger, Kenney & Harrington, PC
14	19390 West 10 Mile Road Southfield, MI 48075
15	Marvin Wilder
16	Lillian F. Diallo Law Offices 500 Griswold, Suite 2340
17	Detroit, MI 48226
18	Matthew Wise
19	Foley & Mansfield, PLLP 130 East Nine Mile Road
20	Ferndale, MI 48220
21	Barry A. Wolf Barry A. Wolf, Attorney at Law, PLLC
22	503 South Saginaw Street, Suite 1410 Flint, MI 48502
23	Edwar A. Zeineh
24	Law Office of Edwar A. Zeineh, PLLC 2800 East Grand River Avenue, Suite B Lansing, MI 48912
25	Hallsting, Hr 40012

August 7, 2019

1	<u>To Obtain a Certified Transcript Contact:</u> Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR
2	Federal Official Court Reporter United States District Court
3	200 East Liberty Street - Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	<u>INDEX</u>
11	MISCELLANY
12	
13	Proceedings7 Certificate37
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE CLERK: Calling the Flint Water Cases. 3 THE COURT: Welcome. Please be seated. And I would 4 like to log on to my computers and then have appearances for 5 the record. And what I'll do is just start0. Over here we 6 have Ms. Deborah Greenspan who's the special master appointed 7 in this case. Then we can go down the front row of the jury 8 box. 9 MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Gladys Christopherson for the Anderson and Lee plaintiffs. 10 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. WASHINGTON: Val Washington for the Anderson and 13 Lee plaintiffs, Judge. 14 THE COURT: Good. You don't have your sling. 15 MR. WASHINGTON: I got full range of motion. How 16 about that? 17 THE COURT: So this is good. Well, congratulations. 18 MS. LINDSEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Cynthia 19 Lindsey on behalf of putative class plaintiffs. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 MR. BLAKE: Good afternoon. Jayson Blake liaison to 22 the state court plaintiffs, class. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. 24 MR. HART: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David Hart on 25 behalf of the Guertin plaintiffs.

```
1
               THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Bronstein.
 2
               MR. BRONSTEIN: Peretz Bronstein on behalf of
 3
      putative class plaintiffs.
 4
               MR. STAMATOPOULOS: Gregory Stamatopoulos on behalf
 5
      of class plaintiffs.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 7
               MS. BEREZOFSKY: Esther Berezofsky on behalf of class
 8
      plaintiffs and the Gulla plaintiffs.
 9
                           Thank you.
               THE COURT:
                          Paul Novak on behalf of class plaintiffs.
10
               MR. NOVAK:
               MR. GOODMAN: William Goodman for the class
11
12
      plaintiffs and for the Marble plaintiffs as well.
13
               MR. STERN: Your Honor, Corey Stern as co-liaison
      counsel for individual plaintiffs.
14
15
               THE COURT: Okay. And we had Mr. Napoli in place of
16
      Mr. Shkolnik at our in chambers conference that was held at
17
      one o'clock. And he indicated something about a flight
18
      getting altered that he had to leave early.
19
               MR. STERN:
                          That's correct. He just left.
20
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
21
               MS. BINGMAN: Your Honor, Teresa Bingman standing in
22
      for Michael Pitt, co-lead class counsel.
23
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Bingman.
24
               MR. LEOPOLD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
25
      Leopold, co-lead for the punitive class.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Thank you.
              MR. KIM: Good afternoon, Your Honor. William Kim on
 2
 3
     behalf of the City of Flint. I believe it's no longer
 4
     necessary to continue to appear on behalf of Dayne Walling who
 5
     has been dismissed on behalf of your last order.
 6
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 7
               MR. BERG: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Rick Berg on
 8
     behalf of City of Flint.
 9
               MR. RUSEK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alexander
     Rusek on behalf of Howard Croft.
10
11
               THE COURT: Thank you.
12
               MR. ERICKSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Philip
     Erickson on behalf of the LAN defendants and Leo A Daly.
13
14
               THE COURT: Good.
                                  Thank you.
              MR. KLEIN: Good afternoon. Sheldon Klein for the
15
16
     City of Flint.
17
               MS. DEVINE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alaina
18
     Devine on behalf of VNA defendants.
19
               MR. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. James
20
     Campbell for the VNA defendants.
21
               MS. LEVENS: Good afternoon. Emmy Levens for the
22
      class.
23
               MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Cirilo
24
     Martinez for the class.
25
               MR. WILDER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Marvin
```

```
Wilder appearing for Lillian Diallo for individual plaintiffs,
 1
 2
     Gist, Kirkland, and Savage.
 3
               THE COURT: Good. Thank you.
               MR. KUHL: Good afternoon. Richard Kuhl for state
 4
 5
      defendants.
 6
               MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Craig
 7
     Thompson for Defendant Rowe.
 8
               MR. MORGAN: Thaddeus Morgan for Liane Shekter Smith.
 9
               MR. GRASHOFF: Phil Grashoff on behalf of Stephen
     Busch.
10
11
               MR. ZEINEH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Edward
12
     Zeineh on behalf of Daugherty Johnson.
13
               MR. MEYERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David
14
     Meyers on behalf of Daugherty Johnson.
15
               MR. KRAUSE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Kirk Krause
16
      on behalf of Robert Scott.
               MR. BARBIERI: Charles Barbieri on behalf of Michael
17
18
      Prysby and Patrick Cook.
19
               MR. FAJAN: James Fajan on behalf of Adam Rosen.
20
               MR. WEGLARZ: Your Honor, Todd Weglarz for individual
21
     Odie Brown and Gradine Rogers.
22
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
23
               MR. MATEO: T. Santino Mateo on behalf of Darnell
24
     Earley.
25
               MS. FLETCHER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
                                                           Shayla
```

```
Fletcher on behalf of the Alexander plaintiffs.
 2
               MS. MULDER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Megan
 3
     Mulder on behalf of Defendant McLaren.
 4
              MR. LOTT: Your Honor, Austen Lott on behalf of the
 5
     Bern plaintiffs.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 7
               MR. MARKER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Christopher
     Marker here on behalf of Michael Glasgow.
 8
 9
              MR. WISE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Matt Wise on
10
     behalf of Jeffrey Wright.
11
               MR. GALVIN: Joseph Galvin, Your Honor, also on
12
     behalf of Mr. Wright.
13
              MR. WOLF: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Barry Wolf on
     behalf of Gerald Ambrose.
14
15
              MR. JENSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Larry
      Jensen on behalf of Hurley Medical Center, Ann Newell and Nora
16
     Birchmeier.
17
18
              MR. RADNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Solomon
     Radner on behalf of the Washington plaintiffs.
19
20
              MR. CAFFERTY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael
21
     Cafferty on behalf of Nancy Peeler.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you. Okay. Well, welcome to
23
     everyone who's here.
24
               I set forth an agenda for this status conference.
25
     And I want to begin with a couple of things that aren't
```

actually on the agenda. And the first is to discuss who needs to be present in terms of lawyers at future status conferences now that the motions to dismiss in Carthan have been adjudicated and the motions to dismiss in Walters and Sirls have also been determined.

And when you combine those two decisions there are a number of defendants who were dismissed in those cases. It was brought to my attention that there's not a final order of dismissal as to those defendants because that ordinarily in the ordinary course of litigation only happens at the conclusion of either a verdict being reached or a final motion to dismiss that adjudicates the entire case.

And in light of the fact that that may not be for some time, I want to make sure that the lawyers for those defendants who have been dismissed are not required to be here at any future motion hearings or status conferences, telephonic conferences and so on.

Anyone is welcome to be here who thinks it's in your client's interest to be present or in the public interest. No one is excluded from this courtroom under any circumstances that I can think of. We've had a few disruptions in different cases. But nothing like that would happen or has happened here.

So from hereon out, those lawyers when there's a notice to appear, you may get the notice because your client

has not had a final order of dismissal entered, but you are not required to be here. You won't be expected to be here. And you'd certainly be welcome if you show up.

So is there any question? Is that clear? Anybody have any questions about that? Okay.

Then the next thing I wanted to do is go over the impact of the decision in the Walters and Sirls cases is. And in terms of what's yet to be decided in terms of additional short form complaints.

And I see that we have some members of the community.

I'm sure that you're plaintiffs in our case. I would

anticipate maybe you are. I want to especially welcome you

here. And to the extent there are defendants who are here who

are clients, I'd like to welcome you as well.

I will tell all of you that what we deal with in these conferences is literally in the weeds. Like we are at blades of grass that might show up between -- I don't want to reference weeds because this is such an important case to everyone here. So I'll just say blades of grass instead.

So it may be a little tedious and you're welcome to talk to your lawyers at the conclusion to make sure any questions are answered.

So this is one of those areas which is deeply in tiny blades of glass. So what we have in the individual cases -- and Mr. Stern, I might call upon you to help me through this

because you're here representing the individual plaintiffs.

And so what we have is a master complaint that was filed in Walters and Sirls. Then we have short form complaints in Walters and Sirls. And those have been now the motions to dismiss have been determined. Some claims continue on. Some don't. Many defendants continue on. Some don't.

There are some claims, there's a CERCLA claim, an intentional infliction of emotional distress. There are some state law claims from some old -- a former complaint that may have boxes checked on the short form complaints that are still pending.

Mr. Stern, how do you suggest we address those? Because they were not incorporated in your new long form complaint.

MR. STERN: If I understand -- Corey Stern for the plaintiffs. I just want to make sure I understand your question. To the extent that claims still remain --

THE COURT: Boxes checked on earlier short form complaints referencing counts that no longer exist.

MR. STERN: So in my experience, they just no longer exist. But there are not -- there's not a necessity for an amended short form complaint. It's just that the lawyers that are prosecuting those cases based on the orders in Walters and Sirls, based on the related orders that you previously entered as to how you would deal with Walters and Sirls, when

juxtaposed with the other short forms would deem that your order was applicable to each of the other short form complaints.

Such that defendants who have those claims against them at this point in time in those short form complaints that are not Walters or Sirls should know that those counts have also been dismissed as to those short form complaints.

THE COURT: That's the way I would like to address it. But what I'd like to make sure all of the lawyers in the individual cases know is that if you want to bring a CERCLA, an intentional infliction of emotional distress, any other state law counts or federal counts that are currently not in Walters and Sirls, you will need to file a motion for leave to amend to include those. Because they are not in your cases anymore.

So the defendants do not need to answer those counts that are not in Walters and Sirls, the master or those short form complaints.

The one exception to that will be the cases in the Marble and the Brown case. Those are two cases unlike many of the others that raise legionella claims against two different hospitals in Flint, McLaren and Hurley Hospital.

So for those cases, the amended short form complaint is due August 19th. And what I'll say to be very clear about that is in those instances, McLaren and Hurley are new

```
defendants that have not been adjudicated previously in
Walters, Sirls, or Carthan. So you will need to set forth
your allegations against those defendants in your short form
supplement or complaint.
         And the answer -- the motion to dismiss or answer, it
will be due 30 days later on September 19th. And I will let
-- those defendants who've already been dismissed, you're out.
You don't have any work to do.
         Those defendants who are still in, the only argument
that I want to hear in your motion to dismiss -- and certainly
if you're filing an answer this doesn't apply.
         But if you choose to file a motion to dismiss, then
your motion should be regarding the new allegations and not a
repetition of all of the arguments that you've already made in
Walters and Sirls. Those will be -- I'll have one paragraph
at the beginning saying the Court incorporates all of its
decision in Walters and Sirls into this decision.
we're now going to address additional claims related to
```

Mr. Goodman.

McLaren and Hurley.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOODMAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Say your name and your client.

MR. GOODMAN: William Goodman appearing on behalf for purposes on this question on behalf of the Marble plaintiffs.

I take it that by allowing an explicated version of

```
certain claims in the form of a short form complaint, the term
 1
 2
      short form is a term of art here. And since these are
 3
      somewhat elaborate claims may require a little bit of --
               THE COURT: An addendum.
 4
 5
               MR. GOODMAN: Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: Yes.
 7
               MR. GOODMAN: And in particular in the case of the
      Marble family and plaintiffs, we're talking about the claim of
 8
 9
      intentional infliction of emotional distress which has both
      state common law grounds and in my opinion substantive due
10
11
      process over 1983 grounds as well.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, I don't know -- I can't
13
      comment on whether it does or doesn't. But I can say that if
14
      you want to bring a substantive due process claim that has not
15
      previously been adjudicated, then you'll need to set it forth
16
      in your supplemental filing to your short form.
17
               MR. GOODMAN:
                             Thank you, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. All right. So that's what will
19
      happen.
20
               Then in terms of answers being filed to Walters and
      Sirls, those will now be due September 3rd. And an answer
21
22
      should be filed on Walters, an answer in Sirls, and then with
23
      respect to every other short form that currently exists, an
24
      answer -- a one-page reference to that answer can be filed.
```

You don't need to repeat your entire answer unless you might

```
wish to.
 1
 2
               Mr. Campbell, did I get that wrong? You looked at me
 3
 4
               MR. CAMPBELL: No.
                                   I'm just listening intently, Your
 5
      Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. You know the one
 7
      problem I foresee with this is that in the short form
 8
      complaint, there's going to be an allegation that like 15
 9
      people lived at a particular address or something. And you
      may want to answer but you don't know if that's true or not.
10
11
               So there could be some additional detail than the one
12
      page. But you don't have to answer all of the allegations in
13
      the long form complaint that are adopted in each short form.
14
      Okay.
15
               And what we're going to do is if the first few -- if
16
      the defendants get busy working on these answers, a problem
17
      arises that you realize, you know, I can't just adopt all of
18
      that because of the way it's presented, you'll let me know and
19
      we'll solve the problem.
20
               MR. STERN: Your Honor?
21
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
22
               MR. STERN: When it comes to the short form
23
      complaints, to the answers to the short form complaints and
24
      filing a notice, it may be appropriate for defendants just to
25
      say a boilerplate.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
To the extent there exist facts that are specific to
the individual plaintiffs in the case, you know, defendants
are without sufficient information to admit or deny and
defendants further adopt their previous answer as filed.
         And this way it's still a boilerplate notice.
         THE COURT: Yeah.
         MR. STERN: So they don't have to redo it every time
but it preserves their right to sort of, you know, discover
that information as the litigation goes on.
         THE COURT: I think that's a good idea. So we'll do
that.
        MR. KUHL: Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Yes.
         MR. KUHL: Richard Kuhl for state defendants.
those of us that have state defendants, which is Governor
Snyder, we wouldn't be filing an answer.
         THE COURT: No.
                   So do we need to file anything or is it
         MR. KUHL:
presumed that any appeal we file in Walters and Sirls will
stay our obligation to --
         THE COURT: Absolutely. And I wanted to get to that
            Well, Mr. Erickson.
next. Yes.
         MR. ERICKSON: Philip Erickson representing the LAN
defendants and Leo A Daly. Just to clarify. So defendants
will now file master answers. Defendants that were in Walters
```

and Sirls that are still in Walters and Sirls will file a master answer as to the master complaint. Then we'll also file short form answers as to the short form complaints in Walters and Sirls.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ERICKSON: But my question is, is it true that the Court is not now requiring answers to short form complaints in all of the other individual cases at this time given the pendency of the bellwether process?

THE COURT: So you're suggesting -- what does the bellwether process have to do with filing a one-page answer in all of the other short form individual cases?

MR. ERICKSON: Well, it's just -- it seems unnecessary in that none of those cases is going to be proceeding to trial and only the bellwether claims in the near term are going to be proceeding to trial.

THE COURT: Yeah, but those cases exist. They're on my docket. I need to know that the defendants know about them. I keep track of every case on my docket. If an answer's not filed, I issue a show cause why it shouldn't be dismissed for failure to prosecute because the plaintiff has not brought it to my attention.

Just to satisfy that obsessive nature, I think it's important to -- if you've got a lawsuit, there has to be an answer. And then we're going to put those -- we're going to

hold on to those until it's time for them to be -- to go to

```
2
      trial.
               MR. ERICKSON: I understand, Your Honor. And I was
 3
 4
     seeking clarification.
 5
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 6
               MR. ERICKSON: And you provided it. In light of the
 7
     Court's desire that we answer in all cases where there's been
 8
     a short form complaint filed, we --
 9
               THE COURT: Except Marble and Brown because we're
10
     going to have new -- you know, that will go on its own track.
11
               MR. ERICKSON: Understood. We talked upstairs about
12
     having until September 3rd to answer in Walters and Sirls.
13
     would request on behalf of all defendants more time --
14
               THE COURT: Absolutely.
15
               MR. ERICKSON: -- to process the other answers.
               THE COURT: Let's do October 3rd.
16
17
                              That's reasonable.
               MR. ERICKSON:
18
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. I don't know if that's a weekday.
19
           October 3rd.
     Good.
20
               MR. GALVIN: Your Honor, Joseph Galvin on behalf of
21
      Jeff Wright. With respect to Marble and Brown, each of those
22
     has a count styled 1983 due process denial of access to
23
      judicial remedies. I do not believe that there has been a
24
     determination by this Court.
25
               Did I understand you earlier to say that defendants
```

who had been otherwise dismissed should not file a motion to

```
2
      dismiss as to Marble and Brown because those cases were to
 3
      relate to the two hospitals only?
 4
               THE COURT: Let me -- that's a good question. Mr.
 5
      Goodman, this due process failure to have access to the
 6
               What is that claim? I've never heard of it.
      courts.
 7
               MR. GOODMAN: That claim is that if you deprive
 8
      people of information, which is what happened in the Marble
 9
      case and I think --
10
               THE COURT: But McLaren and Hurley are private
11
               So you're not suing them for a constitutional --
12
               MR. GOODMAN: We've alleged that they are 1983
13
      coconspirators with the public defendants.
14
               THE COURT: I see.
15
               MR. GOODMAN: And I think that I can provide the
16
      Court with case law on that.
17
               THE COURT: No, I don't want to argue it now.
18
      what I'm trying to figure out is we just have a practical
19
      question. Is Jeff Wright a defendant in that?
20
               MR. GOODMAN: I think so. But I would have to -- I
21
      would have to go back and review my pleadings and make sure.
22
               THE COURT: Okay.
23
               MR. GALVIN: As a technical matter, Jeff Wright is
24
      included in the category of government defendants who are
25
      alleged to have conspired.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: I see.
 2
               MR. GALVIN: Even though what they had to say about
      legionella.
 3
                   I don't know.
               THE COURT: That's okay. We won't argue it.
 4
 5
               MR. GALVIN: I understand, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. I think -- what I would ask you,
 7
      Mr. Goodman, is to make sure when you're -- if you're
 8
      amplifying claims that we know who your defendants are.
 9
               If the drain commissioner of Genesee County conspired
      to deprive people of their right to access to the courts, we
10
11
      need to know specifically so his lawyer will know whether to
12
      respond.
13
               MR. GOODMAN: Understood, Your Honor. And I have
      stood up with an additional question which is as to the date
14
15
      on which the responses are due. I think you mentioned Sirls
16
      and Walters but not Marble and Brown with regard to this
      October 3rd extension.
17
18
               Does that apply to legionella cases as well as the
19
      October 3rd extension?
20
               THE COURT: No. The legionella cases are going to be
      -- you're going to file your amended short form August 19th.
21
22
               MR. GOODMAN: That's right.
23
               THE COURT: Answers or motions to dismiss on
24
      September 19th.
25
               MR. GOODMAN:
                            Thank you.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right. So the issue of 2 stays pending qualified impunity. I'll get to you Mr. 3 I think it's clear. But to the extent it may not Erickson. 4 be clear, Mr. Kuhl had asked about our former Governor Snyder 5 being a defendant in Carthan. 6 He has an appeal pending claiming qualified immunity 7 and other kinds of immunity. And any defendant that is 8 currently on appeal or will shortly be on appeal in a 9 particular case, the case is stayed as to unnecessary discovery for that defendant. 10 11 But in the Guertin case, we have essentially all of 12 the defendants. We don't have Governor Snyder in there. But 13 any defendant that has answered is now in the case and must 14 respond as a party to the case and not a nonparty. 15 So then let me say on the issue of discovery -- oh, 16 Mr. Erickson, go ahead. 17 Thank you, your Honor. Philip MR. ERICKSON: 18 Erickson on behalf of the LAN defendants and Leo A Daly. 19 I wanted to raise another issue similar to the one 20 that Mr. Galvin just raised. And that is in the Brown case 21 and its companion case or similar case filed by Mr. Weglarz, 22 there is a claim, at least one and maybe more than one, that's 23 brought against the engineering defendants that is not in 24 Marble -- in Walters or Sirls. And that claim is a 1983 claim 25 against the private companies.

So that will have to be briefed and addressed in some

```
2
      way in the Brown and Rogers cases.
 3
               THE COURT: It will. It certainly will. Thank you.
 4
               So basically what we have is defendants will only
 5
      need to dismiss -- move to dismiss claims that have not been
 6
      previously adjudicated. So if something new comes up in Brown
 7
      or the Marble case, that will absolutely need to be briefed.
 8
               Mr. Kuhl.
 9
               MR. KUHL: Your Honor, you mentioned --
               THE COURT: Richard Kuhl on behalf of the state.
10
11
                          I'm sorry, Your Honor. Richard Kuhl on
               MR. KUHL:
12
      behalf of the state defendants. You mentioned counts.
13
      the individual allegations that are made in Marble and Brown
14
      could change the analysis.
15
               For example, if somebody contracted legionella and
16
      died in the fall of 2014 and somebody didn't become, as
17
      alleged in Walters and Sirls, didn't gain knowledge of the
18
      legionella problem until spring of 2015, the analysis is going
19
      to be different. And so I'm assuming that we are going to be
20
      permitted to address those.
21
               THE COURT: Oh, you can address them. Yeah.
22
      Anything that alters the analysis or is new or different, you
23
      can address.
24
               Mr. Washington.
25
               MR. WASHINGTON: Judge, Val Washington on behalf of
```

```
1
      the Anderson and Lee plaintiffs. As sometimes happens when
 2
      there's a lot of publicity surrounding litigation, people come
 3
      out of the woodwork. Individuals come out of the woodwork.
 4
               THE COURT: Okav.
 5
               MR. WASHINGTON: So my question is if we are
 6
      approached by people who have not previously filed short form
 7
      complaints or don't consider themselves part of any class
 8
      proceeding, should we at this time file a short form complaint
 9
      on their behalf or should we just have them stand down at this
10
      point?
11
               THE COURT: No, no, no. You should represent your
12
      clients zealously in the way you see fit to represent them.
13
      So if you -- you have clients who wish to sue and they're
      within the statute of limitations, I leave it to you and your
14
15
      client to decide what to do.
16
               MR. WASHINGTON: Thanks, Judge.
17
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
18
                             May it please the Court, Phil Grashoff
               MR. GRASHOFF:
19
      on behalf of Stephen Busch.
20
               Just so it can be cleared up. I want to understand
21
      what happens to the CERCLA claim in the Brown case that has
22
      been pending, box checked off, I agreed -- well --
23
               THE COURT: Okay. I get you. I'll let you finish if
24
      needed.
               What's going to happen to the CERCLA claim in the
25
      Brown case is I'm assuming they're not going forward with it.
```

But should Mr. Weglarz decide that he wants to bring a CERCLA claim, he's going to have to tell us the allegations that would support -- the factual allegations that would support such a claim.

MR. GRASHOFF: So that fits in with Mr. Stern's earlier explanation. That claim is gone because it had preexisted and it's the Sirls and Walters decision that was made withdrawing that claim stands unless the plaintiffs' counsel in Brown decides to reassert it with new facts.

THE COURT: With facts, yes.

MR. GRASHOFF: Got it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So the next issue is how discovery disputes will be handled for the next six month period. And I'm going to do this only for -- on a trial basis for six months and amend it if necessary or change courses entirely if necessary.

What I will do is reserve one hour on my docket every two weeks to have a discovery conference call if necessary.

It does not need to be used for that purpose if there are no disputes.

These hearings will be by telephonic status conference. The telephone number will be on the docket. And they will not be on the record because I think what we'll be doing is problem solving. And we will be just trying to resolve the issue. If they can't be resolved, then written

motions will be filed and a hearing held and so on.

But in order to reserve a spot for discussion of a discovery dispute, the parties to it will be required to meet and confer with one another to try to resolve it or to narrow the issues. And if they cannot resolve or narrow the issues, they will jointly contact the law clerk assigned to the case to request time on the docket.

A response will be given where you'll know when the hearing will be held. And a one-page single space letter can be submitted through the law clerk to identify the dispute. That will be accompanied by the subpoena, the requests for production of documents, the requests for admissions.

Whatever the issue is, I'll want to see the underlying documents just as they are or the answers, the document with the answers that you may believe are insufficient. I'll need that one-page single spaced letter two days ahead of the telephonic status conference.

If the issues are not or cannot be resolved, then I will set a briefing schedule for briefing of the motion to compel or motion to quash or whatever the motion might be. So we'll put that in an order following this hearing so that it's clear how that will be handled.

Now in the submissions for this conference, there was an indication that it may be helpful to have an update on Freedom of Information Act requests. Is that still an issue?

```
No? Okay. And the document subpoenas -- Mr. Berg, I think I
 1
 2
      was told that you may discuss with us a shared subpoena
 3
     tracking process.
 4
               MR. BERG: Rick Berg on behalf of the City of Flint.
 5
      I'll be very brief, Your Honor.
 6
               We had a conference call on Monday. The idea of a
 7
      centralized spreadsheet was discussed and the consensus was it
 8
     seemed like a good idea. We have, through my office, created
 9
     a Google Docs location that we would propose to use for that.
     Rather than circulate it and begin using it because we knew
10
11
      this was on the agenda and if there was opposition, I thought
12
      I would talk about this first and invite others to talk about
13
     it.
               But we have the document uploaded and we'll make it
14
15
      available. And the process is easy to use like any kind of
16
      system of that nature.
17
               THE COURT: And it's password protected because if
18
      some of the information is medical information or blood tests
19
      things like that it won't be available to the public.
20
               MR. BERG: Yes. Although at the moment the process
21
      that we're contemplating does not include any of the
22
      responsive documents. It's only to track the process.
23
               THE COURT: I see.
                                   I get it. Okay. Okay. Right.
24
     Of course. You're not going to upload all the responsive
25
      documents.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
It's just to see who's been served,
         MR. BERG: No.
who's not been served, whether documents have been produced,
who has them, how many pages, what one might do if one wanted
to acquire them from a person who got them.
         THE COURT: That's an excellent idea. Is there any
opposition to this plan?
                         Okay.
        MR. LEOPOLD: No.
         MR. STERN:
                    No.
                           Hearing from both the plaintiffs'
         THE COURT:
                    Okay.
counsel that there's no opposition there, it sounds like a
very good idea.
         MR. BERG: We'll circulate the information to the
subpoena subcommittee in the next day or so and we'll be off
and running.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. BERG:
                    Thank you.
         THE COURT: Yeah. You're welcome.
         Is there anything further from this agenda item on
bellwether selection? Anything that needs to be discussed?
Okay.
         In the Burgess case versus United States and the
related cases, there are I think four or five, maybe five
cases in front of Judge Parker where plaintiffs, many, many
thousands of plaintiffs are suing the United States equal
protection agency.
```

She responded to me and let me know that the briefing 2 won't be done until the middle of August. I think something 3 like August 16th. And so she'll be turning her attention to 4 it after that. 5 Once that decision is made as to whether -- what the 6 government is doing there is they're seeking an opportunity to 7 appeal Judge Parker's decision denying their motion to dismiss. 8 9 If she grants them the right to have an interlocutory 10 appeal, meaning an appeal to the Sixth Circuit before final 11 judgment, then that will certainly take place. If she denies 12 that, then she and I will discuss her -- whether she will transfer those cases to this court so that all of the 13 14 litigation can be coordinated. But we won't have that discussion until her decision is made. 15 16 So the next issue that I wanted to talk about is just 17 to have on the record here whether there is any coordination 18 with the state court litigation that I should try to 19 undertake. And my sense is that there isn't, but I think we 20 should have a report. 21 MR. STERN: Your Honor, there's a status conference 22 23 THE COURT: Corey --24 MR. STERN: Sorry. Corey Stern on behalf of 25 individual plaintiffs as co-liaison counsel. Judge Yuille has

scheduled a status conference for a week from today in Genesee County. Assuming that conference goes forward, the agenda items will be the same as what's previously been discussed with him.

There are numerous pending dispositive motions before

Judge Yuille that need to be ruled upon before anyone believes

he'll take or can take further action including adopting or

creating his own case management order to address bellwether

cases as well as class certification issues in state court.

So it's a holding pattern presently with a hope that a week from today on Wednesday the 14th there is some movement with regard to the pending motions or at least some direction from Judge Yuille as to whether those motions are headed.

THE COURT: Okay. And thank you.

I wanted to ask Deborah Greenspan if you could provide a report as the special master. And for those of you who are not ordinarily here, Deborah Greenspan has been appointed by myself to fill a role under the federal rules of civil procedure that's called special master.

And she has a number of assignments. And one of them is to keep track of the various cases that are filed, the number of plaintiffs who are represented. The fees and expenses that are expended in these representations, as well as a number of other duties that she has been tirelessly addressing.

So Ms. Greenspan.

SPECIAL MASTER GREENSPAN: Thank you, your Honor. I have a very brief report today and it's focused only on what we've been calling the tracking the cases that have been or the claims that exist that have retained counsel that we've been receiving information on from the various plaintiffs' forms.

So when I was here at our last status conference, I reported that we had -- I was close to being able to submit a second interim report on the status of all of these identified claims. About a week after that status conference, I received an extensive update from plaintiffs' counsel on claims, the status of various claims, which caused a need to revise all of the information in the report and the tracking charts and all of the analysis of duplicate claims. So that has all been completed.

I believe that there's another slight adjustment that may occur that I'd like to incorporate in the next report.

I'll have some more information hopefully later in the week so that I will then be able to submit an updated report. I just don't want to submit one that's going to be changed in a couple of weeks.

So just to give a little bit of information. When I was here in June, I reported that we thought that there were 18,769 individuals who had retained counsel. That does not

include individuals who've contacted counsel or are on counsel's notice list but actually have not signed a retainer agreement. That was also accounting for duplicates. And a duplicate means that we find the same individual in a list presented by more than one plaintiff firm.

That number has now been reduced to 17,719 based on the updates that we've had and the change in categories of some of these individual claims. So it's about a thousand reduction.

And I also wanted to report that at the last status conference I think I noted that we were collecting injury information. Meaning we'd ask firms to state what the claim of injury is. What type of injury we're talking about.

Most firms had submitted data that suggested lead exposure as the injury. But we were trying to get some additional details about that. I have received a substantial amount of information and will be -- it will be recorded in the next report.

There's a range of different injuries alleged from cognitive impairment to hair loss to things that we've heard of in this litigation. But I now have some numbers associated with those. So that will be included in the next iteration of this report, which I hope we can get out in a week or so.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much.

SPECIAL MASTER GREENSPAN: Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And I appreciate the report a great deal. And as brief as the report is, it does not come near to representing the amount of work that goes into all of this. So I want to repeat again my appreciation for Ms. Greenspan's work. And just remind those lawyers who are submitting this information how critical it is to the process. If we don't know who the plaintiffs are, if we don't know what has happened to your clients or what you alleged has happened to them, it makes the whole process more difficult. So I would just ask everybody to respond promptly and accurately to the requests from Ms. Greenspan. The next item on the agenda is a discussion of the appointment of subclass counsel. And since we were last here, plaintiffs made a written motion to appoint certain

individuals to be subclass counsel.

I denied that motion and have now had an opportunity in chambers to hear from interim co-lead class counsel that they have a new roster of individuals who could fulfill this duty.

So they are going to submit that new motion I believe within approximately a week or less. I would encourage them to do it as soon as you can so that this process can move along.

And I think in the agenda I called it subclass counsel and it is for settlement allocation and settlement

purposes. So we do not have a class certified. What we are working on is -- with this particular issue is seeing whether the parties can reach a settlement in the case. And it requires subclass settlement counsel on an interim basis.

So if there's nothing else -- is there anything else that we have not covered? All right.

Then what we'll do is the next conference will be held on September 25th, 2:00 PM here with a 1:00 PM meeting of the executive committee in chambers.

And I would like to on the record thank my law clerk, Hallam Stanton who has been here a little over a year working almost exclusively day and many nights and some weekends to assist me in this case. And Hal, I appreciate it tremendously. I will miss you a great deal. But I told him we'll send the U.S. Marshal service after him to bring him back if we have some questions for him. So I want to thank you, Hal.

And also Allison Hall is also leaving. She's been in the background helping with this case as well as many other cases. But I have a new Clark, Eric Baudry who has just joined us from Minnesota. He comes from Minnesota via Yale Law School. So he's going to be with us to help us.

And then I'll have two more law clerks by September.

And Antonia Giles is here. She is a student at U of D,

University of Detroit Mercy. So she's been great to have here

1	this summer a little bit. And she's leaving all too soon.
2	So if there's nothing else, then we'll adjourn until
3	September 25th.
4	(Proceedings Concluded)
5	
6	
7	
8	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
9	I, Jeseca C. Eddington, Federal Official Court
10	Reporter, do hereby certify the foregoing 37 pages are a true
11	and correct transcript of the above entitled proceedings.
12	/s/ JESECA C. EDDINGTON 8/28/2019 Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR Date
13	bace
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	